DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0302/167451.01
Application No.: 09/775,033
Office Action Dated: November 3, 2005

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 and 42-67 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 42 and 67 are the independent claims.

In the After Final Official Action, dated November 3, 2005, claims 1-27 and 42-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Paroz (US Patent No. 6,587,125) in view of Humpleman et al., or "Humpleman," (US Patent No. 6,243,707).

Applicants have amended the independent claims (1, 42 and 67) herein to make it clear that the user preferences referred to in the claim language are user preferences specified by the user for the Universal Console. No new matter was added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The outstanding rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully traversed.

As discussed previously, with the invention, **a user interacts with a universal console (UC) 200 to specify a set of preferences, and the set of preferences is stored in the UC 200.** Thus, when UC 200 instantiates a concrete user interface (UI) the **UC 200 takes and uses the stored user preferences to instantiate a concreted UI,** and the user is therefore presented with a user-preferable interface.

In contrast, Paroz does not disclose any user interaction for specifying, or storing, user preferences to be taken into account when a second computing device instantiates a concrete UI (e.g., a DHTML page). Although Paroz discloses customizing the DHTML pages (e.g., for properties such as window size, font, language, color, refresh rate, target device, and

Page 9 of 11

communication protocol), the customization of DHTML pages is done by the window

analyzer 34 according to parameters such as target second computing device, communication

type, or target browser, on a DHTML-page-by-DHTML-page basis. There is no disclosure of

user interaction to specify and store user preferences that may be taken into account in

generating DHTML pages. In short, neither user interaction for specifying user preferences

nor storing of user preferences is taught or suggested by Paroz.

The Examiner on page 8 of the November 3, 2005 Official Action agrees that Paroz

does not teach or suggest such user interaction to store user preferences, since the Examiner

broadly equates user preferences with "storing users status in the local server." Without

conceding the propriety of such reasoning, Applicants have amended the claims herein to

clarify the interaction with respect to user preferences in accordance with the invention,

namely that the system of the invention is one that is operable to receive the user's

preferences from the user.

Therefore, in combination with all of the other elements of the claims, Paroz cannot

be considered to teach or suggest "receiving input from a user indicative of at least one user

preference for the UC... instantiating a concrete UI by the UC taking into account the stored

at least one user preference," as recited in amended claim 1, or similarly cannot be said to

teach or suggest "means for receiving input from a user indicative of at least one user

preference for the UC ... means for instantiating a concrete UI by the UC taking into account

the stored at least one user preference," as recited in amended claim 67.

Likewise, Paroz cannot be said to teach or suggest "a universal console (UC) for

controlling at least one computing element and operable to store user preferences input to the

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0302/167451.01
Application No.: 09/775,033
Office Action Dated: November 3, 2005

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

computer system by the user ... wherein the UC generates a concrete UI description from said canonical UI and the stored user preferences," as recited in amended claim 42.

As discussed previously, Applicants respectfully submit that Humpleman does not cure the above-identified deficiency of root reference Paroz with respect to the claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 42 and 67 are believed allowable over Paroz and Humpleman, whether taken alone or in combination. Claims 2-27 and 43-66 depend either directly or indirectly from claim1 and 42, respectively, and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-27 and 42-67 patentably define over the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-27 and 42-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is thus earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Remarks are responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action, and submit that Claims 1-27 and 42-67 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: December 27, 2005

_____
Thomas E. Watson
Registration No. 43,243

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439